

EXHIBIT 76

BEFORE THE AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION

North American Court of Arbitration for Sport Panel

United States Anti-Doping Agency,)
)
 Claimant,)
 v.)
)
 Floyd Landis,)
)
 Respondent)

AAA No. 30 190 00847 06


DECLARATION OF DON H. CATLIN, M.D.

I, Don Catlin, declare:

1. I make these statements based on my personal knowledge and if called as a witness could testify competently to the matters contained herein.
2. I was the director of the Olympic Analytical Laboratory at the University of California at Los Angeles (the "UCLA Laboratory") since its inception in 1982 until March, 2007. In addition to being the director of the UCLA Laboratory, I was also a professor of Molecular and Medical Pharmacology at UCLA. I am also a licensed physician. One particular area in which much of my research, teaching and publication has been focused is steroid pharmacology. I have been a member of the IOC Medical Commission since the mid-1980s and from that time have served on that Committee's Subcommittee on Doping and Biochemistry. That Subcommittee deals with the rules and regulations for laboratory accreditation, the IOC list of prohibited substances and other matters related to doping. I am also a member of the WADA Health, Medical, & Research Committee. The purview of that committee is all aspects of medicine and science that pertains to doping, doping control, and testing. My statements herein are based on my role as laboratory director with firsthand experience in interacting with athlete observers for B samples.
3. Paul Scott was an employee at the UCLA Laboratory from May, 2004 to October, 2006. His working title was Director of Client Relationships. His University title was Manager.
4. Unofficially I used Mr. Scott as legal counsel to the laboratory during his tenure at UCLA.
5. Mr. Scott's main responsibilities concerned explaining our laboratory procedures to new and potential new clients, to advise me on the rules and regulations of WADA, USADA, and UCLA, and to assist with negotiations between the laboratory and UCLA regarding a long term solution to the future of the laboratory.

6. Mr. Scott had no scientific role within the lab.
7. Mr. Scott had no responsibility for or expertise with respect to the T/E or IRMS analysis.
8. The B confirmation analysis is usually the only time during doping control procedures where the laboratory staff that conducted the analysis and the athlete's experts are in close physical contact.
9. I recall several discussions with Mr. Scott about the various tricks and techniques used by outside experts for athletes to befuddle and foil the B sample analysis. Mr. Scott is very familiar with these tricks and techniques.
10. The UCLA laboratory has had problems with interference by athlete representatives in the past, particularly in high profile cases. By way of example, on one occasion, a mistake was made during B sample analysis as a result of an athlete's expert's distracting conduct that resulted in the B sample having to be re-run.
11. The role of an athlete representative is to observe the analysis and laboratory procedures, not to direct them or influence them. B sample analysis is not an opportunity for the athlete to conduct discovery or impromptu witness examinations. Laboratory personnel should not be requested or expected to perform additional tests, including control, linearity, and stability tests, during the course of the observed analyses.
12. As director for an anti-doping laboratory, I would not consider it proper to provide Standard Operating Procedures to athlete representatives during the B sample analysis so that they could follow along.
13. Based on my years as director of an anti-doping lab, it would be improper to allow an athlete representative to talk to lab employees during the course of analysis. Such conversation could distract the employee from his or her work and provide a basis for an athlete to claim errors or inattention on the part of the lab, even if such results were caused by the athlete representative.
14. It would be improper to allow an athlete's expert to question the Laboratory Director under the guise of "observing" the analysis.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed in Los Angeles, California on April 30, 2007.



Don H. Catlin, M.D.